UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 08/549,322 | 10/27/1995 | PASCAL PENNETREAU | SLVAY-0829 | 1565 |

23416 7590 10/24/2003

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP
P O BOX 2207
WILMINGTON, DE 19899

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| PUTTLITZ, KARL J | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 1621 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 08/549,322 | PENNETREAU ET AL. | |
| | Examin r | Art Unit | |
| | Karl J. Puttlitz | 1621 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 May 2002 and 04 June 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☐ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *21-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### Prosecution Before the Examiner under 37 C.F.R. § 1.196(b)

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wairaevens, Rao and admitted prior art as set forth in the Decision on Appeal (the decision) from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (the Board) mailed March 15, 2003.

Claims 1-28 are allowed based on the amendments and remarks set forth in the Amendment under Rule 196(b)(1) dated May 15, 2002 and the Correction to Amnedment under Rule 196(b)(1) dated June 4, 2002. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 11 were amended in a form distinguishing from the prior art of record and overcoming the Board's rejection based on Wairaevens, Rao and admitted prior art.

Namely, the claims were amended to positively recite steps of providing a liquid reaction mixture containing an organic solvent consisting of at least one saturated organic halogenated hydrocarbon at all times of the reaction and introducing hydrogen fluoride and vinyl chloride reactants into this reaction mixture. Accordingly, clams 1-28 stand allowed.

Claims 21-29 were not amended in this manner. Rather, claim 21 was amended to recite that a vinyl chloride content is maintained in the reaction mixture at less than 15% by weight throughout the reaction. However, this amendment, i.e., throughout the reaction, does not place the rejected claims outside of the Board's rejection because it does not add any new elements to claims 21-29 that distinguish from the applied prior art. Specifically, the claim previously stated that the "vinyl chloride content is maintained in the reaction mixture at less than 15% by weight" before the amendment was made.

Accordingly, the examiner is bound to maintain the rejection to claims 21-29 under § 103 over Wairaevens, Rao and admitted prior art for the reasons set forth in the decision. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.196 (b)(1) ([t]he new ground of rejection is binding on the examiner), see also M.P.E.P. § 1214.01 ("If the examiner does not consider that the amendment and/or showing of facts overcomes the rejection, he or she will again reject the claims. If appropriate, the rejection will be made final.")

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Applicant is reminded of the practice set forth in M.P.E.P. § 1214.01 ("[a]n applicant in whose application such a final rejection has been made by the examiner may mistakenly believe that he or she is entitled to review by the Board of the rejection by virtue of the previous appeal, but under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.196(b)(1), after such a final rejection, an applicant who desires further review of the matter must file a new appeal to the Board. Such an appeal from the subsequent rejection by the examiner will be an entirely new appeal involving a different ground and will require a new notice of appeal, appeal brief, and the payment of the appropriate fees.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl J. Puttlitz whose telephone number is (703) 306-5821. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (alternate).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (703) 308-4532. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Karl J. Puttlitz
*Assistant Examiner*

Johann R. Richter, Ph.D., Esq.
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Biotechnology and Organic Chemistry
Art Unit 1621
703-308-4532

***